

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MARIO MOLINA,
Plaintiff,
v.
K. HOLLAND, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. 1:15-cv-01260-DAD-EPG (PC)
ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF’S MOTION
FOR APPOINTMENT OF PRO BONO
COUNSEL
(ECF NO. 57)

Mario Molina (“Plaintiff”) is a state prisoner proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* with this civil rights action filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On June 26, 2017, Plaintiff filed a motion for appointment of pro bono counsel. (ECF No. 57).

Plaintiff asks for appointment of counsel because he is unable to afford counsel, because he is visually impaired, because he has limited knowledge of the law, because he has limited ability to speak and understand English, because he has no ability to investigate the facts of this case, because this case will likely involve expert witnesses, because this case will involve conflicting testimony, and because the issues involved in this case are extremely complex.

Plaintiff does not have a constitutional right to appointed counsel in this action, Rand v. Rowland, 113 F.3d 1520, 1525 (9th Cir. 1997), withdrawn in part on other grounds, 154 F.3d 952

1 (9th Cir. 1998), and the Court cannot require an attorney to represent Plaintiff pursuant to 28
2 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1). Mallard v. United States District Court for the Southern District of Iowa,
3 490 U.S. 296, 298, 109 S.Ct. 1814, 1816 (1989). However, in certain exceptional circumstances
4 the Court may request the voluntary assistance of counsel pursuant to section 1915(e)(1). Rand,
5 113 F.3d at 1525.

6 Without a reasonable method of securing and compensating counsel, the Court will seek
7 volunteer counsel only in the most serious and exceptional cases. In determining whether
8 “exceptional circumstances exist, the district court must evaluate both the likelihood of success of
9 the merits [and] the ability of the [plaintiff] to articulate his claims *pro se* in light of the
10 complexity of the legal issues involved.” Id. (internal quotation marks and citations omitted).

11 The Court will not order appointment of pro bono counsel at this time. The Court has
12 reviewed the record in this case, and at this time the Court cannot make a determination that
13 Plaintiff is likely to succeed on the merits of his claims. Moreover, based on the record in this
14 case, it appears that Plaintiff can adequately articulate his claims.

15 Plaintiff is advised that he is not precluded from renewing the motion for appointment of
16 pro bono counsel at a later stage of the proceedings.

17 For the foregoing reasons, IT IS ORDERED that Plaintiff’s motion for appointment of pro
18 bono counsel is DENIED without prejudice.

19 IT IS SO ORDERED.
20

21 Dated: June 28, 2017

22 /s/ Eric P. Gray
23 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
24
25
26
27
28